



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,611	10/06/2000	Raman K. Rao	RAO-011	1358
7590 01/15/2004				
STEPHEN E. BALDWIN 751 LAUREL ST., PMB 621 SAN CARLOS, CA 94070				
		EXAMINER RAMAKRISHNAIAH, MELUR		
		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
		2643		
		DATE MAILED: 01/15/2004		

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/680,611

Applicant(s)
Raman K. Rao et al.

Examiner
Melur. Ramakrishnaiah

Art Unit
2643



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 27, 2003
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14-21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2643

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 11-12, are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Pentel (US PAT: 6,425,524, filed 8-27-1999).

Regarding claim 11, Pentel discloses a gastronomic information and instruction system comprising: a mobile communication device (14, figs. 1- 4) having a built in Multichannel transmitter and receiver or multichannel multiplexing transmitter and receiver (col. 3 lines 56-67, col. 4 lines 1-30), a local or network server (reads on 14, fig. 1) and means for communicating

Art Unit: 2643

between the mobile device (12, fig. 1) and a local or network server (14, fig. 1) via wired or wireless means (col. 5 lines 50-67, col. 6 lines 1-40, col. 7 lines 14-16).

Regarding claim 12, Pentel further teaches the following: multi-channel multiplexing transmitter and receiver at one or more locations at a restaurant or other food service establishment and or the local network server (140, figs. 12-13, col. 6 lines 1-40, col. 7 lines 14-16).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pentel in view of Brown et al. (US PAT: 6,527,712, filed 5-31-2000, hereinafter Brown).

Regarding claim 13, Pentel does not teach the following: means by which gastronomic tables, decision matrices, health charts, price comparison charts and other customer defined, vendor defined or established defined information, in a detailed or macro form, may be maintained at one or more locations on the mobile device, the local and or the network server for efficient decision making, execution and monitoring.

However, Brown discloses auditing public health which teaches the following: means by which gastronomic tables, decision matrices, health charts, price comparison charts and other

Art Unit: 2643

customer defined, vendor defined or established defined information, in a detailed or macro form, may be maintained at one or more locations on the mobile device, the local and or the network server for efficient decision making, execution and monitoring (col. 22 lines 9-67, col. 23 lines 1-61).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Pentel's system to provide for the following: means by which gastronomic tables, decision matrices, health charts, price comparison charts and other customer defined, vendor defined or established defined information, in a detailed or macro form, may be maintained at one or more locations on the mobile device, the local and or the network server for efficient decision making, execution and monitoring as this arrangement would facilitate better management user's personal needs as taught by Brown.

5. Claims 14-21, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melur Ramakrishnaiah whose telephone number is (703) 305-1461. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7 AM to 4 PM.

Art Unit: 2643

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz, can be reached on (703) 305-4708. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-9508.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

7. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-6306, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 305-9508 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Application/Control Number: 09/680,611

Page 6

Art Unit: 2643

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


Melur. Ramakrishnaiah

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 2643.